REMARKS

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish claim 1 from U.S. Patent No. 6,307,837 ("Ichikawa"). Ichikawa neither describes nor renders obvious the features of "excluding, at the host system's outgoing buffer, the segment of data from transmission based on the comparison between the portion of the segment and the list." Rather, Ichikawa merely discloses the discarding of a "data packet," without indicating the location of where the data packet is discarded:

> Specifically, the terminal address/VLAN-ID comparison section 15 searches in the terminal information table shown in Table 1, and if there is a set of a terminal address and a VLAN-ID in the table to match the source address 4-2 and VLAN-ID 4-3 in the data packet, the identity is considered to match the terminal information. Filtering section 16 examines the comparison result received, and if the identity matches the terminal information, data packet is sent to the destination terminal specified in the destination address 4-1 (5-2). If the destination terminal is connected to the user LAN 1-4, the data packet is transmitted from gateway 1-3 to user LAN 1-4 though gateway 1-1 or gateway 1-2. If the destination terminal is connected to the wireless packet network, the data packet is sent to the destination terminal without going through the gateway. On the other hand, if the VLAN-ID and the source address 4-2 in the received packet do not match the content in the terminal information, filtering section 16 discards the data packet. (Ichikawa, 9:12-29.)

For at least any or all of these reasons, Ichikawa fails to anticipate claim 1 and therefore claim 1 is patentable. Claims 17, 27 and 38 include similar limitations to claim 1 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is rejected as being rendered obvious by Ichikawa in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,282,683 ("Dapper"). Specifically, the Examiner maintains that the following passage from Dapper allegedly teaches the features of "intentionally corrupting the segment so that the segment is discarded from traffic received over a network connection:"

> Since the desired bit error rate is a maximum, the Poisson equation is applied successively with values for χ of 0 up to the maximum number. The sum of these probabilities is the probability that no more than χ frame errors occurred for each monitored parity error. The results for a bit error rate of 10-3 and bit errors per frame error of 1 and 8 are shown in Table 3. (Dapper, 117:7-12.)

Applicant respectfully contends that the above cited neither describes nor renders obvious "intentionally corrupting the segment so that the segment is discarded from traffic received over a network connection." Dapper's teaching of a "bit error rate" fails to teach "corrupting" a segment of data, let alone doing so *intentionally*. In fact, Dapper suggests that its bit error rates result from natural transmission occurrences, as opposed to being intentionally corrupted.

For at least any or all of these reasons, claim 10 is patentable. Claims 24 and 35 include similar limitations to claim 10 and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 10.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable. In addition, due to the clear distinction of the independent claims over Ichikawa, Applicant believes it unnecessary to argue the further novel features of all of the dependent claims.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-0916001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2009

/Christina V. McDonough/
Christina V. McDonough
Reg. No. 64,612

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

27267184.doc